PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

See form PCT/SA/220 WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43b/s.1) Date of malling (day/month/year) see form PCT/SA/210 (second sheet)) Pplicant's or agent's file reference ee form PCT/SA/220 International application No. International application No. International filing date (day/month/year) 15.03.2005 Priority date (day/month/year) 26.03.2004 Priority date (day/month/year) 26.03.2004 Priority date (day/month/year) 26.03.2004 CONNIXLUKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS N.V. CONNIXLUKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS N.V. Whis opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. II Priority Box No. IV Lock of unity of invention Box No. VI Certain defects in the international application in the international application in the international application in Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Pox No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Pox No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Pox No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Pox No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Pox No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Pox No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Pox No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Pox No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Pox No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Pox No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Pox No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Pox No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Pox No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Pox No. VIII Certain defects in the international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the international defec	n the ERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHOL	RITY		REC'D 16 JUN 2005
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1) Date of mailing (day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet) FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below Ternational application No. International filling date (day/month/year) Priority Priority Box No. II Priority Box No. II Priority Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Priority Box No. IV Priority Box No. IV Priority Certain decembers cited Box No. VI Certain decembers cited Box No. VII Certain decembers cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Priority Certain defects in the international application Priority Certain deservations on the international application Box No. VIII Priority Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Priority Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Priority Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Priority Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Priority Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Priority Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Priority Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Priority Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Priority Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Priority Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Priority Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Priority Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII B	o:,			PCI
pplicants or agents file reference ee form PCT/SA/220 International application No. CT/B2005/059907 International application No. CT/B2005/059907 International price of the price of th	see form PCT/ISA/220		INTERNATION	IAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY
Ree form PCT/ISA/220 International application No. Priority date (day/month/year) 26.03.2004 International patient Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC 3606F13/16, G06F15/167 Replicant CONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS N.V. I. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Certain detects in the international application supplicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain detects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority (*IPEA**). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailling of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.			Date of mailing (day/month/year) see	e form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)
ternational application No. 15.03.2005 15.03.2005 26.03.2004	pplicant's or agent's file reference ee form PCTASA/220		FOR FURTHER A See paragraph 2 belo	
Applicant KONINKLUKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS N.V. 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. Basis of the opinion			(day/month/year)	
1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: □ Box No. I Basis of the opinion □ Box No. II Priority □ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability □ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention □ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement □ Box No. VI Certain documents cited □ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority (*IPEA**). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.	nternational Patent Classification (IPC) or t 606F13/16, G06F15/167	ooth national classification	n and IPC	
 Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of malling of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. 	opplicant KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRO	ONICS N.V.		
	Box No. I Basis of the operation in the applicant chooses an Author International Bureau under Rulwill not be so considered. Box No. III Non-establish Dox No. IV Lack of unity of Box No. IV Lack of unity of Box No. VI Reasoned state applicability; of Box No. VII Certain defect Box No. VIII Certain defect Box No. VIII Certain observing Bo	ment of opinion with reof invention tement under Rule 43c itations and explanation nents cited ts in the international a vations on the internat eliminary examination nal Preliminary Examination the foother than this one 66.1 bis(b) that writte bove, considered to be ply together, where ap g of Form PCT/ISA/220	egard to novelty, inventually	vill usually be considered to be a However, this does not apply where he chosen IPEA has notified the mational Searching Authority he IPEA, the applicant is invited to



European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Kamps, S

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7070



WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/IB2005/050907

_	Box N	l .ol	Basis of the opinion
1.	the la	ngua	I to the language , this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in ge in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
		This of angua under	pinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following age, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search. Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2.	With neces	regar ssary	d to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
	a. typ	oe of s	material:
) as	sequence listing
) tat	ple(s) related to the sequence listing
	b. fo	rmat o	of material:
	C) in	written format
		3 in	computer readable form
	c. tir	ne of	filing/furnishing:
	E		ontained in the international application as filed.
] fil	ed together with the international application in computer readable form.
	[⊐ fu	rnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
	3. 🗆	has	didition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional es is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as copriate, were furnished.
	Λ Add	ditions	al comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/IB2005/050907

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

1-8

Claims

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

1-8

No: Claims

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims

1-8

Claims

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Re Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1 Prior Art

Reference is made to the following document:

D1: JUN XU: "Asynchronous interconnection and interfacing of Intellectual Property cores in the design of Systems-on-Chip" CENTRE FOR CONCURRENT SYSTEMS AND VLSI SCHOOL OF COMPUTING, INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND MATHEMATICS - SOUTH BANK UNIVERSITY, [Online] 2 October 2002 (2002-10-02), pages 125-153, XP002330546 LONDON Retrieved from the Internet: URL:http://www.scism.sbu.ac.uk/ccsv/SBU-CI SM-02-18/> [retrieved on 2005-06-06]

2 Clarity

- 2.1 The application does not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT, because claims 1, 7 and 8 are not clear.
- 2.2. The independent claims 1, 7 and 8 do not include the features which are necessary to define the matter for which protection is sought in terms of the context of the application (see PCT Guidelines 5.43 and 5.53). In this respect, the entire contents of the application (e.g. background of the invention and discussion of problems in the prior art; summary of the invention; detailed description; drawings) convey the impression that the claimed "transaction retraction" function is to be carried out in an integrated circuit having a plurality of processing modules which communicate over an on-chip interconnect using a split transaction communication protocol, as suggested by the description on page 3, line 6-14 and page 11, line 10-13. It is clear that the above mentioned integrated circuit, i.e an integrated circuit which uses a split transaction communication protocol over an on-chip interconnect, is actually improved, not the general "integrated circuit" as claimed. Although it is described on page 5. line 29-30 that the "transaction retraction" function may also be performed in a multi-chip network or system with several integrated circuits, it is not disclosed how. It is therefore suggested to adapt the designation of the subject matter of the independent claims by incorporating the additional feature of using a

split transaction communication protocol over an on-chip interconnect.

3 Novelty / Inventive Step

- 3.1 The document D1 is regarded as being the closest prior art to the subject-matter of claim 1, and shows (the references in parentheses applying to this document):
 - Integrated circuit having a plurality of processing modules, wherein at least one first processing module issues at least one transaction towards at least one second processing module (page 126, fig. 5.1.1).
- 3.2 The subject-matter of claim 1 differs from this known integrated circuit in that it comprises at least one first transaction retraction unit for indicating the allowance to said at least one first of said processing modules to retract said at least one transaction according to the state of said second processing module.
- 3.3 The subject-matter of claim 1 is therefore new (Article 33(2) PCT).
- 3.4 The problem to be solved by the present invention may be regarded as how to avoid that the second processing module is left in an incorrect state due to the transaction retraction.
- 3.4 The solution to this problem as outlined in section 3.2 of this communication is considered as involving an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT) for the following reasons:
- 3.5 Document D1 discloses a method for transaction retraction in an integrated circuit having a plurality of processing modules which use DTL (Device Transaction Protocol) for communication over a synchronous on-chip bus (page 127, 2nd paragraph). This method does not use a transaction retraction unit as claimed, but the second processing module is enforced by the protocol to process the transaction in merely one cycle (see also description of the prior art in the application on page 3, line 22-35).

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

International application No.

PCT/IB2005/050907

- 3.5 Document D1 further proposes an enhancement to the DTL protocol for asynchronous communication and in this context addresses a similar problem as described in section 3.3 of this communication: If the first processing module alters a transaction, before the second processing unit has accepted the original transaction, the second processing unit could also be left in an incorrect state. D1 solves this problem (see page 146, 2nd paragraph) by introducing an asynchronous wrapper at the first and second processing module, whereby the wrapper at the first processing module does not transfer an altered transaction until the current (out-of-date) command transaction at the target wrapper has completed. I.e. the second processing module is required to consume the transaction twice.
- 3.6 There is no indication to adapt or modify the solution in D1 to arrive at the solution provided by the invention. In particular, there is no hint to make transaction retraction dependent on the state of the second processing module.
- 3.7 Independent method claim 7 and independent system claim 8 have all the features of independent apparatus claim 1 and as such also meet the requirements of the PCT with respect to novelty and inventive step.
- 3.8 Claim 2-6 are dependent on claim 1 and as such also meet the requirements of the PCT with respect to novelty and inventive step.

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

	TENT COOPER	Anon mea	REC'D 16 JUN 2005	
rom the ∛TERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTH	ORITY		WIPO PCT	
То:			PCT	
see form PCT/ISA/220		INTERNATION	EN OPINION OF THE IAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY PCT Rule 43 <i>bis</i> .1)	
		Date of mailing (day/month/year) see	e form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)	
Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA/220		FOR FURTHER A See paragraph 2 below	w	
International application No. PCT/IB2005/050907	International filing date (da 15.03.2005	ay/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year) 26.03.2004	
International Patent Classification (IPC) o G06F13/16, G06F15/167	r both national classification a	nd IPC		
Applicant KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTF	RONICS N.V.			
1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. Basis of the opinion				
Name and mailing address of the ISA:		Authorized Officer	gartichin Printer.	

European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Kamps, S

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7070



WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/IB2005/050907

	Box No	
١.	the land	gard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in grade in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
	☐ Thi	is opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following guage , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search lider Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2.	With re	gard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and ary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
	a. type	of material:
		a sequence listing
		table(s) related to the sequence listing
	b. form	nat of material:
		in written format
		in computer readable form
	c. time	e of filling/furnishing:
		contained in the international application as filed.
		filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
		furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
	r C	n addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional soples is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
	4. Addit	ional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/IB2005/050907

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

1-8

1-8

No:

No:

Claims

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims Claims

Yes: Claims

Industrial applicability (IA)

Claims No:

1-8

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

International application No.

PCT/IB2005/050907

Re Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

Prior Art 1

Reference is made to the following document:

JUN XU: "Asynchronous interconnection and interfacing of Intellectual Property cores in the design of Systems-on-Chip" CENTRE FOR CONCURRENT SYSTEMS AND VLSI SCHOOL OF COMPUTING, INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND MATHEMATICS - SOUTH BANK UNIVERSITY, [Online] 2 October 2002 (2002-10-02), pages 125-153, XP002330546 LONDON Retrieved from the Internet: URL:http://www.scism.sbu.ac.uk/ccsv/SBU-CI SM-02-18/> [retrieved on 2005-06-06]

2 Clarity

- The application does not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT, because claims 1, 2.1 7 and 8 are not clear.
- 2.2. The independent claims 1, 7 and 8 do not include the features which are necessary to define the matter for which protection is sought in terms of the context of the application (see PCT Guidelines 5.43 and 5.53). In this respect, the entire contents of the application (e.g. background of the invention and discussion of problems in the prior art; summary of the invention; detailed description; drawings) convey the impression that the claimed "transaction retraction" function is to be carried out in an integrated circuit having a plurality of processing modules which communicate over an on-chip interconnect using a split transaction communication protocol, as suggested by the description on page 3, line 6-14 and page 11, line 10-13. It is clear that the above mentioned integrated circuit, i.e an integrated circuit which uses a split transaction communication protocol over an on-chip interconnect, is actually improved, not the general "integrated circuit" as claimed. Although it is described on page 5. line 29-30 that the "transaction retraction" function may also be performed in a multi-chip network or system with several integrated circuits, it is not disclosed how. It is therefore suggested to adapt the designation of the subject matter of the independent claims by incorporating the additional feature of using a

split transaction communication protocol over an on-chip interconnect.

3 Novelty / Inventive Step

- 3.1 The document D1 is regarded as being the closest prior art to the subject-matter of claim 1, and shows (the references in parentheses applying to this document):
 - Integrated circuit having a plurality of processing modules, wherein at least one first processing module issues at least one transaction towards at least one second processing module (page 126, fig. 5.1.1).
- 3.2 The subject-matter of claim 1 differs from this known integrated circuit in that it comprises at least one first transaction retraction unit for indicating the allowance to said at least one first of said processing modules to retract said at least one transaction according to the state of said second processing module.
- 3.3 The subject-matter of claim 1 is therefore new (Article 33(2) PCT).
- 3.4 The problem to be solved by the present invention may be regarded as how to avoid that the second processing module is left in an incorrect state due to the transaction retraction.
- 3.4 The solution to this problem as outlined in section 3.2 of this communication is considered as involving an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT) for the following reasons:
- 3.5 Document D1 discloses a method for transaction retraction in an integrated circuit having a plurality of processing modules which use DTL (Device Transaction Protocol) for communication over a synchronous on-chip bus (page 127, 2nd paragraph). This method does not use a transaction retraction unit as claimed, but the second processing module is enforced by the protocol to process the transaction in merely one cycle (see also description of the prior art in the application on page 3, line 22-35).

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

International application No. PCT/IB2005/050907

- 3.5 Document D1 further proposes an enhancement to the DTL protocol for asynchronous communication and in this context addresses a similar problem as described in section 3.3 of this communication: If the first processing module alters a transaction, before the second processing unit has accepted the original transaction, the second processing unit could also be left in an incorrect state. D1 solves this problem (see page 146, 2nd paragraph) by introducing an asynchronous wrapper at the first and second processing module, whereby the wrapper at the first processing module does not transfer an altered transaction until the current (out-of-date) command transaction at the target wrapper has completed. I.e. the second processing module is required to consume the transaction twice.
- 3.6 There is no indication to adapt or modify the solution in D1 to arrive at the solution provided by the invention. In particular, there is no hint to make transaction retraction dependent on the state of the second processing module.
- 3.7 Independent method claim 7 and independent system claim 8 have all the features of independent apparatus claim 1 and as such also meet the requirements of the PCT with respect to novelty and inventive step.
- 3.8 Claim 2-6 are dependent on claim 1 and as such also meet the requirements of the PCT with respect to novelty and inventive step.